

**REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully considered the prior art cited by the Examiner in the Office Action mailed January 18, 2006. For reasons set forth below, Applicant believes that the references cited by the Examiner do not, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the claimed invention. Reexamination of this application is therefore respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 70, 84, and 106 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Beason in view of Krasner. Claim 70 is directed to a mobile station including a GPS receiver. The mobile station of claim 70 generates GPS assistance data and sends the assistance data to another mobile station. Claims 84 and 106 are directed to mobile stations that receive GPS assistance data from another mobile station and use the assistance data to determine their location.

Neither Beason nor Krasner teach or suggest the transfer of GPS assistance data between two mobile stations. Beason discloses two-way radios with GPS receivers. Each radio is capable of determining its location from GPS signals and transmitting its location to other radios. The radios include a display that allows the user to see the location of all radios. Beason does not teach or suggest sending GPS assistance data from one radio to another. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion of using the location information received from a first radio to determine location of the second radio. On the contrary, each radio in Beason independently determines its location without regard to the location information received from other radios.

The patent to Krasner discloses a base station having a GPS receiver, a transmitter for sending Doppler information to a GPS mobile unit, and a receiver for receiving pseudo-range information from a mobile unit. Contrary to the Examiner's analysis, there is no indication in Krasner that the pseudo-range information received from one mobile unit is sent to another.

Nor is there any indication that GPS assistance data is transferred from one mobile station to another.

Since neither Beason nor Krasner disclose the basic inventive concept of transferring GPS assistance data between two mobile stations, these patents do not render claims 70, 84, or 106 obvious. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully solicited.

The Examiner also rejected claim 92 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Pihl in view of Krasner and further in view of Honda. Pihl discloses a network-assisted mobile terminal GPS system in which the network transmits GPS assistance data to a plurality of mobile stations. In Pihl, the GPS assistance data is stored in the network and transmitted by the network to the mobile stations. There is no suggestion in Pihl of sending GPS assistance data from one mobile station to another as recited in claim 92.

The patent to Krasner has been discussed above in connection with claims 70, 84, and 106. Krasner is similar to Pihl in that it teaches sending GPS assistance data from the network to the mobile station. Krasner does not teach or suggest sending GPS assistance data from one mobile terminal to another.

Honda teaches a relay technique for propagating information to a plurality of mobile stations. The idea in Honda is to transmit information in a series of hops from one mobile terminal to another so that information can be propagated over long distances using low power. There is no suggestion in Honda of using this technique to transmit GPS assistance data.


Neither Pihl, Krasner, nor Honda teach or suggest transmitting GPS assistance data from one mobile station to another for use in acquiring GPS signals. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to independent claim 92.

Inasmuch as the independent claims appear to define over the prior art of record, it follows that the dependent claims are allowable.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully urged that the present application is in  
condition for allowance and notice to such effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

COATS & BENNETT, P.L.L.C.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "David E. Bennett", is written over a horizontal line.

David E. Bennett  
Registration No.: 32,194

Dated: January 26, 2006

P.O. Box 5  
Raleigh, NC 27602  
Telephone: (919) 854-1844  
Facsimile: (919) 854-2084